

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 1 has been amended to additionally recite the features recited in claims 6, 7 and 9. It is respectfully submitted that no substantive claim amendment has been made. As such, it is respectfully submitted that this amendment does NOT necessitate a new search by the Examiner.

Per the telephone conference with the Examiner, it is also believed that the Examiner will withdraw the rejections under 35 USC § 112 which have been traversed by the applicant.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 5-15, 18 and 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 5,742,905 (*Pepe at al.*) in view of U.S. patent Application Publication US2002/0049833 A1 (*Kikinis*). This rejection is respectfully traversed below for at least the following reasons:

(a) *Kikinis* does NOT teach a device which is capable of detecting whether to request to display information on another device

It is very respectfully submitted that *Kikinis* does NOT teach a user agent in a device, such that the user agent can detect whether to request to display information on another device. It is noted that *Kikinis* states that “at step 810 the type and functionality of the user’s device is established.” (*Kikinis*, paragraph 108 on page 9, and Fig. 8). However, it is respectfully submitted that establishing the type and functionality of a user’s device does NOT teach or suggest: a device which is capable of determining whether to request to display information on another device.

(b) *Kikinis* does NOT teach a device which is capable of sending a request for display of information on another device when the device detects to request to display information on another device

Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion (Office Action, paragraph 23), it is very respectfully submitted that *Kikinis* does NOT teach a linking agent on a device, such that the linking agent operates to send a request for presentation of the information on another device. It is noted that *Kikinis* states: “at step 811 the control routines of an

enhanced server begin to create the best fit in multimedia content for the requested data according to the user's device capabilities and characteristics." (*Kikinis*, paragraph 109 on page 9, and Fig. 8). However, it is respectfully submitted that creating the best fit in multimedia content does NOT teach or suggest: a device which is capable of sending a request to display information on another device when the device detects to request to display information on another device.

(c) The cited Art cannot possibly teach or suggest a device that is capable of detecting that information should be presented on another device, and requesting that the information be presented on another device

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that *Pepe at al.* and *Kikinis* taken alone, or in any proper combination, cannot possibly teach or suggest the combination of the features recited in claim 1 because, among other things, neither *Pepe at al.* nor *Kikinis* teach a device that is capable of performing either one of the operations noted above in sections (a) and (b). In fact, the methodology of *Pepe at al.* teaches away from detecting by a device whether to request to display information on another device, as it teaches: "if the subscriber's wireless PDA is not turned on or otherwise operable, the notification may be rerouted to an alternative wireless or wire-line network." (*Pepe at al.*, Col. 6, lines 11-19). In other words, the methodology of *Pepe at al.* teaches rerouting information when it is determined by another entity that a device is inaccessible, rather than detecting by the device to request to display information on another device, and subsequently requesting that the information be presented on a different device.

(d) The cited art does NOT teach additional features recited in the dependent claims

For example, claim 14 additionally recites that a linking agent associated with a second device retrieves a reference to information which a first device has requested to be displayed on another device. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion (Office Action, page 9, citing paragraph 100 of *Kikinis*), it is respectfully submitted that *Kikinis* does NOT teach this feature.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. UWP1P041). Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



R. Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300

Amendment to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 8. The “No” label on the arrow from 802 to 804 and a “Yes” label on the arrow from 802 to 806 have been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

